Social / Ethical Implications

1. **Did you make cultural or other assumptions about your users that affect how they interact with Fritter?**

One major assumption made about the users that impacts their interaction with Fritter is that they can read/speak English well. We use words and acronyms that may not be very intuitive to a non-English speaker or a non-native English speaker. For example, in the UI design, if a user navigates to a nonexistent URL, we inform them that the "URL" they navigated to does not exist. However, for many non-native speakers, they may not know that URL stands for Uniform Resource Locator, and even if they did, they may still not know what that means as it uses complex and non-intuitive words. Maybe choosing the word "page" or "webpage" would be more inclusive. Additionally, the tab to view Freets is called the "Feed" (both in the UI and the conceptual design). This may not be intuitive to someone who doesn't speak English or is not a native speaker (or alternatively someone who is not well-versed in slang/young vernacular), as 'Feed' is a more contemporary term used for social media applications, but does not necessarily imply that this is where content is to be found. We are assuming that users are younger native English speakers who are well-versed in contemporary slang.

2. **Would an effective use of design heuristics to maximize engagement with Fritter be manipulative?**

I could see the argument for an effective use of design heuristics to maximize engagement with Fritter being manipulative, however I would argue that in the end the user would still benefit. For example, using design heuristics such as short paths, Fitts's Law, and Gestalt principles of grouping could push a clueless user to a certain location, even if that location is not beneficial to the user or unethical in some way. However, I think the payoff of using design heuristics outweighs the potential and relatively unlikely harmful effects. I believe that using design heuristics to maximize engagement leads to a UI that is more accessible to all as well as inclusive, and I believe it is unlikely that users will be manipulated to navigate down harmful paths.

3. **How would you adjust your design if your only goal were to: get children addicted to Fritter? or make it hard for older people to use Fritter? or stop fake news spreading? or prevent harassment? How, if at all, do your answers to these questions inform how you would actually design Fritter?**

If the design goal were to get children addicted to Fritter, one design choice would be sorting the feed based on a user's particular interests. Right now, it is sorted based on likes, but instead, we could choose to push freets that pertain to a child's interests (e.g. freets related to children's cartoons) to the top of their feed. If the goal were to make it hard for older people to use Fritter, we could choose to make the text of actions and buttons much smaller. If we wanted to stop fake news from spreading, we could potentially create a word bank of 'forbidden' words likely to be associated with partisan/political/inflammatory topics and ban any freets that contain these words (this of course, has the potential effect of banning informative freets containing real news as well). To prevent harassment, we could take a similar approach of banning freets containing hate speech or obscenities. The latter two did not directly inform our Fritter

design, as we did not consider types of freets or content that we would ban on our application. However, the first two questions did guide our design process. In both the concept design and the UI, we intentionally chose to sort the feed based on likes rather than a user's interests to discourage addiction, and we chose to make actions clearly marked with big buttons and big text to include older people and visually impaired people on our platform.

4. **You have the option to allow users to see which other users have upvoted a Freet. What forms of engagement between users (positive or negative) would be encouraged by allowing this?**

There would be several positive and negative implications of this. One positive implication is the spread of content that may be of interest to a user. For example, let's say that I follow one of my friends who has similar interests as me. If I see that this friend liked a freet, I would be more inclined to look at that freet, as it will likely be of interest to me, and thus this freet is receiving more engagement and attention than it would if I am not able to see which users liked it. There are negative implications, however. Perhaps I want to like a freet that pertains to a secret interest of mine. However, if other users can see that I interacted with this freet, then they are able to infer this secret interest, which may be invasive to a user's privacy. Another negative implication is the social effect of seeing who liked one's own freet. Often times, users post something with the intent of certain people seeing that post. If these certain people ignore the post or did not see it, this can greatly affect a user's self-esteem or mental health.

5. **In A3, we asked about stakeholders who aren't your immediate users. Identify a design choice you faced that would benefit or harm such a stakeholder, and explain how.**

One stakeholder of Fritter is politicians who use Fritter to run their campaign. It is very commonplace to engage with users through spreading information about one's platform on these apps. One of our design choices harms this particular stakeholder, however. We chose to not display the likers of a freet to anyone, out of privacy. Because of this, however, someone who is running a political campaign cannot see the demographics of the users who engaged with content relating to their campaign, and this is crucial information for someone who is running for a political position to have. Thus, they are missing out on learning who their key demographic is.

6. **What are the accessibility implications of your design for people with different abilities?**

Both in the UI and concept designs, we clearly mark actions with large text and buttons. Thus, we imply that users do not need to have perfect 20/20 vision to use our application. We did not take into consideration, however, people who are colorblind for our UI. Many of the buttons are blue, as well as our background, and thus colorblind users may have a hard time differentiating between actions. Thus, one of our implications is that Fritter users are not colorblind. As mentioned before, another implication is that Fritter users are English speakers who are well-versed in younger vernacular, as some of our word choices reflect this (e.g. "URL", "Feed"). The last is that everything is done visually on the concept design and the UI, with no audio or voice commands, so we are implying that users cannot be blind or heavily visually impaired.

7. **One of the heuristics is to “speak the user’s language.” In retrospect, assuming you followed this, can you identify what kind of user you had in mind?**

As mentioned before, we assume that our users are native English speakers. We took great measures to make sure that error messages and actions are clear and interpretable, with the caveat that the user is an English speaker. We use phrases like URL, feed, and refreet, which may not be intuitive to a non-native speaker. So yes, we are speaking the user’s language in terms of not returning CS jargon to the user any time they encounter an error, but we are operating under the assumption that the user is a native English speaker.